

OPINION 1323

BYRRHUS SEMISTRIATUS FABRICIUS, 1794 (INSECTA,
COLEOPTERA): CONSERVED

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers it is hereby ruled that the specific name *semistriatus* Fabricius, 1794, as published in the binomen *Byrrhus semistriatus*, is to be given nomenclatural precedence over the specific names *picipes* Olivier, 1790, as published in the binomen *Byrrhus picipes*, and *rufipes* Kugelann, 1792, as published in the binomen *Byrrhus rufipes*, by anyone who considers that these three names, or any two of them, denote the same taxon.

(2) The generic name *Simplocaria* Stephens, 1829 (gender: feminine), type species, by subsequent designation by Jacquelin du Val, 1859, *Byrrhus semistriatus* Fabricius, 1794, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2265.

(3) The following specific names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

- (a) *semistriatus* Fabricius, 1794, as published in the binomen *Byrrhus semistriatus* (specific name of type species of *Simplocaria* Stephens, 1829) with an endorsement that it is to be given nomenclatural precedence over *Byrrhus picipes* Olivier, 1790 and *Byrrhus rufipes* Kugelann, 1792 by anyone who considers that all three names or any two of them denote the same taxon (Name Number 2970);
- (b) *picipes* Olivier, 1790, as published in the binomen *Byrrhus picipes*, with an endorsement that it is not to be given priority over *Byrrhus semistriatus* Fabricius, 1794, by anyone who considers that both names denote the same taxon (Name Number 2971);
- (c) *rufipes* Kugelann, 1792, as published in the binomen *Byrrhus rufipes*, with an endorsement that it is not to be given priority over *Byrrhus semistriatus* Fabricius, 1794, by anyone who considers that both names denote the same taxon (Name Number 2972).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N. (s.)2317

An application for the grant of nomenclatural precedence to *Byrrhus semistriatus* Fabricius, 1794 over *Byrrhus picipes* Olivier, 1790 and *Byrrhus rufipes* Kugelann, 1792 was first received from Dr M. Mroczkowski (Zoological Institute, Warsaw) on 31 August 1979. It was sent to the printer

on 24 February 1981 and printed on 30 November 1981 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, pp. 292–293. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general serials and to eight entomological serials. No comment was received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 September 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)52 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 18, pp. 292–293. At the close of the voting period on 13 December 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — eighteen (18) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Cocks, Brinck, Hahn, Mroczkowski, Schuster, Willink, Halvorsen, Trjapitzin, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Alvarado, Kraus, Corliss, Bayer, Heppell, Binder

Negative Vote — one (1): Ride

Abstention — Uéno.

No votes were returned by Bernardi, Cogger, Dupuis, Lehtinen and Savage.

Uéno commented: 'I cannot vote on this application at present, though I am inclined to vote against it. Dr Mroczkowski does not clarify whether Olivier's type of *B. picipes* is in existence or not. If it does exist and is in good condition and is identical with that of Fabricius's *B. semistriatus*, I believe the name *picipes* should be revived, even if doing so may cause some confusion among byrrhid taxonomists. Since the beetle seems to have no other importance than in pure taxonomy, I feel it unnecessary to use plenary powers in this case.' This comment was passed on to Dr Mroczkowski who said in reply that, so far as he knew, Olivier's type of *B. picipes* did not exist. He added that Kugelann's collection had been completely destroyed.

Ride commented: 'While it is clearly desirable to conserve *semistriata*, I am not convinced that there is a good reason for preserving *B. picipes* and *B. rufipes*. Neither name has been used in the last 50 years (*picipes* has not been used in systematic works since 1847 and since then has been listed up to 1911, but not as a senior synonym; *rufipes* has not been used since its original description except in listings up to 1911 as a junior synonym). On the other hand, *semistriata* has been in continuous use since 1847. Although no details are presented, it seems that a prima facie case is established that the stability of *semistriata* is threatened (Art. 79b). No case is presented that warrants the preservation of the others. I consider that the Commission should only use the relative precedence procedure when a case is made that justifies the preservation of the names concerned. We should be asked to suppress *picipes* and *rufipes*.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

picipes, Byrrhus, Olivier, 1790, *Entomologie, ou histoire naturelle des Insectes*, no. 13, p. 9.

rufipes, Byrrhus, Kugelann, 1792, *Neuestes Mag. Liebhaber Entomol.*, vol. 1 (2-4), p. 485

semistriata, Byrrhus, Fabricius, 1794, *Entomologia systematica*, vol. 4, p. 437

Simplocaria Stephens, 1829, *Nomenclature of British Insects*, Mandibulata, vol. 3, p. 9.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P. (84)52 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1323.

R. V. MELVILLE

Secretary

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

London

4 February 1985